UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI EASTERN DIVISION

MARCUS ENGESSER,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	No. 4:09-CV-485 CAS
)	
"MULTIPLE UNNAMED GUARDS)	
AT FARMINGTON CORRECTIONAL)	
CENTER,")	
)	
Defendants.)	

MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

This matter is before the Court on the application of Marcus Engesser for leave to commence this action without prepayment of the filing fee pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915. Upon consideration of the financial information provided with the application, the Court finds that plaintiff is financially unable to pay any portion of the filing fee. As a result, plaintiff will be granted leave to proceed in forma pauperis pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915.

28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B), the Court may dismiss a complaint filed in forma pauperis at any time if the action is frivolous, malicious, fails to state a claim upon which relief can be granted, or seeks monetary relief against a defendant who is immune from such relief. An action is frivolous if "it lacks an arguable basis in either law or in fact." Neitzke v. Williams, 490 U.S. 319, 328 (1989). An action fails to state a claim upon which relief can be granted if it appears beyond doubt that the plaintiff can prove no set of facts in support of his claim which would entitle him to relief. Conley v. Gibson, 355 U.S. 41, 45-46 (1957).

In reviewing a pro se complaint under § 1915(e)(2)(B), the Court must give the complaint the benefit of a liberal construction. <u>Haines v. Kerner</u>, 404 U.S. 519, 520 (1972). The Court must also weigh all factual allegations in favor of the plaintiff, unless the facts alleged are clearly baseless. <u>Denton v. Hernandez</u>, 504 U.S. 25, 32-33 (1992); <u>Scheuer v. Rhodes</u>, 416 U.S. 232, 236 (1974).

The Complaint

Plaintiff, a resident at the Fulton State Hospital, seeks monetary relief in this 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action against defendants "Multiple Unnamed Guards at Farmington Correctional Center." Plaintiff alleges that from "January through May 2002-2003," the conditions of his confinement were in violation of his Constitutional rights.

To determine the applicable limitations period for § 1983 claims, federal courts borrow state statutes of limitations for general personal injury claims. Owens v. Okure, 488 U.S. 235, 249-50 (1989); Wilson v. Garcia, 471 U.S. 261, 276 (1985). In Missouri, the applicable limitations period for general personal injury claims is five years. Mo. Rev. Stat. § 516.120(4) (2000). Plaintiff's claims allegedly took place in 2002 and 2003, ending in May 2003, and thus, the instant action is untimely, as the complaint was not signed until February 16, 2009. See Lohman v. Kempker, 34 F. App'x 514 (8th Cir. 2002) (applying Missouri five-year statute of limitations to a cause of action under § 1983).

Moreover, fictitious parties generally may not be named as defendants in a civil action. Phelps v. United States, 15 F.3d 735, 739 (8th Cir. 1994). An action may proceed against a party whose name is unknown, however, if the complaint makes allegations sufficiently specific to permit the identity of the party to be ascertained after reasonable discovery. Munz v. Parr, 758 F.2d 1254, 1257 (8th Cir. 1985). In the case at hand, the complaint does not contain specific allegations that would permit the identity of "Multiple Unnamed Guards at Farmington Correctional Center," to be

ascertained after reasonable discovery. These particular "John Doe" defendants are both unidentified and indeterminate in number. This is not permissible. See Estate of Rosenberg v. Crandell, 56 F.3d 35, 37 (8th Cir. 1995) (suit naming "various other John Does to be named when identified" not permissible). For these reasons, the complaint shall be dismissed without prejudice.

Accordingly,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that plaintiff's motion to proceed in forma pauperis is GRANTED. [Doc. 2]

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Clerk shall not issue process or cause process to issue upon the complaint, because it is legally frivolous and fails to state a claim upon which relief can be granted. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B).

An appropriate order of dismissal will accompany this Memorandum and Order.

CHARLES A. SHAW

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Dated this <u>3rd</u> day of April, 2009.